



THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



CHRISTOPHER D. CLEMENT, SR.
COMMISSIONER

JEFF BRILLHART, P.E.
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

**NOTES OF THE
STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM
June 18, 2014; 8:00 AM**

NHDOT Planning and Community Assistance Conference Room, Room G02

ATTENDANCE: Felice Janelle, Dept. of Environmental Services (representing Air Resource Division); Erik Paddleford, Bureau of Rail & Transit; Mike Tardiff, Central NH Regional Planning Commission (representing Rural Planning Commission); Mary Ann Cooney, Dept. of Health and Human Services (representing the Commissioner of DHHS); Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Commission (representing Urban Planning Commission for Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the State); Tim Blagden, Bike Walk Alliance of NH; Debra Samaha, DHMC Injury Prevention Center; Terry Johnson, Foundation for Healthy Communities

ABSENT: Christopher Gamache, NH Dept. of Resource and Economic Development

NHDOT STAFF: Thomas Jameson, Program Manager, Bureau of Planning and Community Assistance; William Watson, Administrator, Bureau of Planning and Community Assistance; John Corrigan, Safe Routes to School Coordinator, Bureau of Planning and Community Assistance

GUESTS: Cameron Prolman, Nashua Regional Planning Commission; Mallory Doolan, Foundation for Healthy Communities

Tom Jameson called the meeting to order at 8:15 AM.

Tom J. reviewed the minutes of the May 21, 2014 meeting. A few minor spelling corrections were noted and the meeting minutes were accepted as final.

Tom J. passed out copies of draft criteria. Four TAPAC members submitted draft criteria and they were compiled into one spreadsheet grouping them into basic categories. Each category was discussed and similar ones were combined into one major category. Bill Watson led the group discussion using the white board to combine ideas into major categories.

- Population served was discussed as a possible category but because TAP funds are distributed based on population it was felt that a category for this isn't required. It will be evaluated after this selection round is finished to see if it should be addressed in a future round.
- Connectivity seemed to be a major category. The ability for users to make safe efficient choices to move around an area or get to that area from another point was the focus. Discussion ensued as to whether multi-modal connections should be grouped under

connectivity or be a standalone category. After much discussion it was decided to make it a separate category.

- Project readiness was discussed. Most felt there were both financial support as well as local support.
 - As part of this discussion it was agreed by the TAPAC that applicants will be required to provide a letter of support from the governing body. This will be a mandatory submission with the applications.
- Safety was discussed. Stress analysis and anxiety levels were discussed. To ensure projects will be used it was felt that a stress analysis needed to be done. Also projects should in some way improve safety over the existing condition.
- Socioeconomic Benefits were discussed. This category seemed to tie into some of the health initiatives that would target specific ethnic or economic groups. It also addressed economic development and quality of life.
- Regional Rankings were then discussed. Traditionally under the Transportation Enhancement program each RPC ranked their regional projects and gave this ranking to the Department and Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee. It was unclear to the TAPAC if each RPC would want to evaluate and rank their regional projects. It was decided that Regional Ranking would be put in as a category and Bill Watson would reach out to the RPC Directors to see if they want to rank projects. This will be decided before the June 25th meeting.

The TAPAC finished up this phase of the criteria development and Bill Watson entered the main categories into Decision Lens. During this phase some of the major categories were then broken into sub-criteria to better define the goal of that criteria. The criteria are as follows:

- Safety
 - Stress Analysis
 - Improve safety conditions
- Potential for Success
 - Project readiness and support
 - Financial readiness
 - Feasibility
- Socioeconomic benefits
 - Economic / tourism benefit
 - Equity
- RPC/MPO ranking
- Multi-modal connections
- Project Connectivity

Bill W. and Tom J. will further define the categories listed above before the next meeting. At the next meeting each of the criteria will be weighed against each other. This also will be done with the sub-categories.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 25, 2014, at 1:00 pm at the NHDOT headquarters in Concord in the Planning & Community Assistance conference room.

The committee adjourned at 11:45 AM.

Notes: Thomas Jameson